arXiv:1612.02444v1 [math.OC] 7 Dec 2016

OPTIMALITY OF HYBRID CONTINUOUS AND PERIODIC BARRIER STRATEGIES IN THE DUAL MODEL

JOSÉ-LUIS PÉREZ* AND KAZUTOSHI YAMAZAKI†

ABSTRACT. Avanzi et al. [5] recently studied the optimal dividend problem where dividends can be paid both periodically and continuously at different transaction costs. In the Brownian model with Poissonian periodic dividend payment opportunities, they showed that the optimal strategy is of pure-continuous, pure-periodic or hybrid-barrier-type. In this paper, we generalize their results to the dual (spectrally positive Lévy) model. The optimal strategy is again of hybrid-barrier-type and can be concisely expressed using the scale function. The results are confirmed through a sequence of numerical experiments.

AMS 2010 Subject Classifications: 60G51, 93E20, 91B30

Key words: dividends; Lévy processes; periodic strategies; scale functions; dual model.

1. INTRODUCTION

In de Finetti's optimal dividend problems, one aims to maximize the expected net present value (NPV) of dividends accumulated until ruin. In other words, the objective is to find the best dividend strategy that, at each time, strikes the balance between maximizing dividends and minimizing the risk of ruin. Because the surplus process is typically assumed to be a time-homogeneous Markov process, the optimal strategy is reasonably guessed to be of *barrier-type*: dividends are paid so that the surplus does not exceed a certain level. With this conjecture, one can follow the classical "*guess and verify*" procedures: the candidate barrier (or the free boundary) is chosen by the continuous/smooth fit principle and then the optimality is shown via verification arguments. While the optimality of a barrier strategy can fail in some cases (see Loeffen [21]), the existing solutions – when they are explicit – are, to the best of our knowledge, barrier strategies or their variations.

In the past two decades, the classical continuous-time optimal dividend problem has been generalized greatly in several directions.

This version: December 9, 2016. J. L. Pérez is supported by CONACYT, project no. 241195. K. Yamazaki is in part supported by MEXT KAKENHI grant no. 26800092.

∗ Department of Probability and Statistics, Centro de Investigación en Matemáticas A.C. Calle Jalisco s/n. C.P. 36240, Guanajuato, Mexico. Email: jluis.garmendia@cimat.mx.

† Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Engineering Science, Kansai University, 3-3-35 Yamate-cho, Suita-shi, Osaka 564-8680, Japan. Email: kyamazak@kansai-u.ac.jp.

1.1. **Generalization of the underlying process:** Regarding the underlying surplus process, the classical Brownian/(compound) Poisson models have been successfully generalized to spectrally one-sided Lévy models.

In insurance, surplus is typically modeled by a spectrally negative Lévy process (Lévy process with only downward jumps). Thanks to the recent developments of *fluctuation theories* (see, e.g., [15, 10]), Avram et al. [7] obtained a concise expression of the expected NPV of dividends under a barrier strategy via the *scale function*. Its optimality criteria were obtained by Loeffen [21]; it holds, in particular, when the Lévy measure has a completely monotone density.

In the *dual model*, spectrally positive Lévy processes (Lévy processes with only upward jumps) are used to model, e.g., the surplus of companies with inventions; see Avanzi et al. [2, 3] for a more detailed motivation of this model. Avanzi et al. [2, 3] showed the optimality of a barrier strategy when the rate of jumps is finite (finite activity) and the jump size is hyperexponential, and Bayraktar et al. [9] later generalized it to the case of a general spectrally positive Lévy process.

1.2. **Generalization of the decision set:** In the *bail-out model* with capital injections, a strategy is now a combination of dividends and capital injections. With the constraint that capital must be injected to prevent ruin, (double) barrier strategies with additional lower barrier at 0 is expected to be optimal. For the spectrally negative and positive Lévy cases, the optimality of such strategy has been shown by Avram et al. [7] and Bayraktar et al. [9], respectively.

In the model with the *absolutely continuous assumption*, the rate of dividend payment must be bounded by a given constant uniformly in time. For the spectrally negative Lévy case that attains a Lévy measure with a completely monotone density, Loeffen et al. [17] showed the optimality of a *threshold strategy* with the resulting controlled process being the *refracted Lévy process* of [16]. The dual model and its bail-out case with capital injections are solved by Yin et al. [31] and Pérez and Yamazaki [27], respectively.

Recently, as a pursuit of more realistic models, the classical continuous dividend strategies are being replaced with *periodic strategies*. Under the constraint that dividend payment opportunities arrive only periodically, it is of interest whether the optimal strategy is still of barrier-type so that the surplus is pushed down to a certain barrier if and only if the surplus is above it whenever opportunities arrive. The existing optimality results are, to our best knowledge, limited to the dual model with dividend decision times given by the arrival times of an independent Poisson process. The finite activity case with i.i.d. hyperexponential jumps has been solved by Avanzi et al. [4]. It was recently extended to a general spectrally positive Lévy model by Pérez and Yamazaki [26].

1.3. **Objective of this paper.** In this paper, we consider the version of the optimal dividend problem considered in Avanzi et al. [5] where dividends can be paid both periodically and continuously. Periodic dividend decision times arrive at the jump times of an independent Poisson process as in [4] and [26], and, in addition, one has an option to pay dividends at any time but at different (proportional) transaction

costs. Avanzi et al. [5] studied the case the surplus is driven by a (drifted) Brownian motion. In this paper, we show that analogous results can be attained when the surplus process is generalized to a spectrally positive Lévy process.

The objective is to show the optimality of the *hybrid (continuous and periodic) barrier strategy*. Namely, for some periodic barrier a and continuous barrier b such that $0 \leq a \leq b$, the surplus process is pushed down to a whenever it is above it at the periodic dividend decision times, while it is also pushed downward continuously so that it does not go above b uniformly in time. In particular, this reduces to the *pure periodic barrier strategy* when $a = b$, and to the *pure continuous barrier strategy* when $b = \infty$. For more detailed discussions on this strategy, see Avanzi et al. [5].

In order to solve the problem, we take the following steps:

(1) The first step is to compute the expected NPV of (both periodically and continuously collected) dividends under the hybrid barrier strategy for any choice of a and b. The controlled surplus process under the hybrid barrier strategy is the dual of the *Parisian reflected process* studied in Avram et al. [8] with additional classical reflection (due to continuous barrier strategy). We shall extend their results and obtain semi-analytical expressions of the expected NPV of dividends via the scale function.

(2) The second step is to select the values of the periodic and continuous barriers, which we call a^* and b^*, respectively. As this is the combination of the classical singular control case as in [9] and the periodic case as in [26], it is clear that the value function is expected to satisfy analogous smoothness conditions at these two barriers.

More precisely, at the level b^* at which the process is *reflected in the classical sense*, as in [9], the value function is continuously differentiable (resp. twice continuously differentiable) when the driving Lévy process is of bounded (resp. unbounded) variation. On the other hand, at the level a^* at which the process is *reflected in the Parisian sense*, as in [26], it is twice continuously differentiable (resp. third continuously differentiable) for the case of bounded (resp. unbounded) variation.

These conditions at b^* and a^* give us two equations, which we call $\mathbf{C}_b$ and $\mathbf{C}_a$, respectively, in this paper. Under the assumption that the driving process drifts to infinity, we shall show that there exists a pair $0 < a^* < b^*$ or $0 = a^* < b^*$ corresponding to the case of a hybrid barrier strategy, or otherwise we choose a pure periodic strategy (i.e. $a^* = b^*$) or a pure continuous barrier strategy (i.e. $b^* = \infty$). For the case $0 < a^* < b^*$, $\mathbf{C}_b$ and $\mathbf{C}_a$ are simultaneously satisfied, while for the case $0 = a^* < b^*$, $\mathbf{C}_b$ and a weaker version of $\mathbf{C}_a$ (with the equality replaced with an inequality) are satisfied. The cases $a^* = b^*$ and $b^* = \infty$ are treated separately.

(3) The final step is the verification of optimality. Again, because this is the combination of the classical singular and periodic cases, the candidate value function is expected to satisfy simultaneously the sufficient conditions given in [9] and [26]. We show that these conditions are indeed

sufficient, and the candidate value function with the barriers selected in the previous steps indeed satisfies these.

The criteria for the optimality of the hybrid barrier strategies ($a^* < b^* < \infty$) and pure periodic/continuous barrier strategies ($a^* = b^* < \infty$ / $b^* = \infty$) are concisely given similarly to the case of Avanzi et al. [5]. This is essentially determined by the frequency of periodic dividend opportunities (the parameter r of the Poisson process) and the net dividend rate β for the continuous dividend strategy. The link between hybrid barrier strategies and pure continuous/periodic barrier strategies can be confirmed by the convergence of the optimal barriers a^* and b^* with respect to r and β.

In order to confirm the obtained analytical results, we also conduct numerical expriments using the case driven by the phase-type Lévy process of [1]. In this case, the scale function admits the form of a linear combination of (complex) exponentials (see [13]), and hence the optimal barriers a^* and b^* as well as the value function can be computed instantaneously. We illustrate how these can be computed, and confirm the optimality and the convergence to the cases where pure continuous/periodic barrier strategies are optimal.

Before we conclude the introduction, we briefly review other recent results regarding the optimal dividend problem in the dual model (in addition to the ones reviewed above). The case with terminal penalty at ruin was studied in Yin and Wen [32]. Zhao et al. [33] studied the bail-out case with random discounting while Li et al. [20] considerd a game version with non-exponential discounting. Marciniak and Palmowski [23] considered the case premiums are surplus-dependent and computed the NPV of dividends. One of the most related results to the current paper is given in Avanzi et al. [6], which studied an extension to the absolutely continuous case [31] where dividends can also be paid without the absolutely continuous restriction if transaction costs are paid – similarly to the conclusions obtained in this paper, they showed that the optimal strategy can be described as a hybrid of barrier and threshold strategies.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the spectrally positive Lévy process and formulates the problem considered in this paper. Section 3 defines the hybrid barrier strategy and constructs the corresponding controlled surplus process. Section 4 obtains the verification lemma (sufficient conditions for optimality). In Section 5, we review the scale function and compute the expected NPV of dividends under the hybrid barrier strategy. Sections 6 and 7 solve for the case the hybrid barrier strategy is optimal: we select the candidate optimal barriers in Section 6 and show that the corresponding candidate value function solves the required variational inequalities in Section 7. Section 8 considers the case when pure continuous/periodic barrier strategies are optimal. We conclude the paper with numerical results in Section 9. Some proofs are deferred to the appendix.

Throughout the paper, $x+ := \lim_{y \downarrow x}$ and $x- := \lim_{y \uparrow x}$ are used to indicate the right- and left-hand limits, respectively. We let $\Delta\zeta(s) := \zeta(s) - \zeta(s-)$ and $\Delta w(\zeta(s)) := w(\zeta(s)) - w(\zeta(s-))$ for any process ζ with left-limits.

2. PROBLEM FORMULATION

2.1. **Spectrally positive Lévy processes.** Let $X = (X(t); t \geq 0)$ be a Lévy process defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we denote by $\mathbb{P}_x$ the law of X when it starts at x and write for convenience $\mathbb{P}$ in place of $\mathbb{P}_0$. Accordingly, we shall write $\mathbb{E}_x$ and $\mathbb{E}$ for the associated expectation operators. In this paper, we shall assume throughout that X is *spectrally positive*, meaning here that it has no negative jumps and that it is not a subordinator. We will assume throughout this work that its Laplace exponent $\psi : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\mathrm{e}^{-\theta X(t)}\big] =: \mathrm{e}^{\psi(\theta)t}, \qquad t, \theta \geq 0,$$

is given, by the *Lévy-Khintchine formula*

$$\psi(\theta) := \gamma\theta + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}\theta^2 + \int_{(0,\infty)} \big(\mathrm{e}^{-\theta z} - 1 + \theta z \mathbf{1}_{\{z<1\}}\big)\Pi(\mathrm{d}z), \quad \theta \geq 0, \tag{2.1}$$

where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma \geq 0$, and Π is a measure on $(0, \infty)$, called the Lévy measure of X, which satisfies

$$\int_{(0,\infty)} (1 \wedge z^2)\Pi(\mathrm{d}z) < \infty.$$

It is well-known that X has paths of bounded variation if and only if $\sigma = 0$ and $\int_{(0,1)} z\Pi(\mathrm{d}z) < \infty$; in this case, X can be written as

$$X(t) = -ct + S(t), \qquad t \geq 0,$$

where

$$c := \gamma + \int_{(0,1)} z\Pi(\mathrm{d}z) \tag{2.2}$$

and $(S(t); t \geq 0)$ is a driftless subordinator. Note that necessarily $c > 0$, since we have ruled out the case that X has monotone paths; its Laplace exponent is given by

$$\psi(\theta) = c\theta + \int_{(0,\infty)} \big(\mathrm{e}^{-\theta z} - 1\big)\Pi(\mathrm{d}z), \quad \theta \geq 0.$$

As is commonly assumed in the literature, we assume that X drifts to infinity, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[X_1] = -\psi'(0+) \in (0, \infty). \tag{2.3}$$

2.2. **Problem.** We assume that dividend payments can be made either periodically or continuously.

The set of periodic dividend decision times is denoted by $\mathcal{T}_r := (T(i); i \geq 0)$, where $T(i)$, for each $i \geq 0$, represents the i^{th} arrival time of the Poisson process $N^r = (N^r(t); t \geq 0)$ with intensity $r > 0$, which is independent of the Lévy process X. This implies that $T(i) - T(i-1)$, $i \geq 1$ (with $T(0) := 0$) are exponentially distributed with mean $1/r$. Let $\mathbb{F} := (\mathcal{F}(t); t \geq 0)$ be the filtration generated by the process (X, N^r).

A strategy $\pi := (L^\pi(t); t \geq 0)$ is a nondecreasing, right-continuous, and $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process where the cumulative amount of dividends L^π has a decomposition:

$$L^\pi(t) := L_c^\pi(t) + L_p^\pi(t), \qquad t \geq 0.$$

Here, $L_c^\pi(t)$ is a non-decreasing, right-continuous, and $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process with $L_c^\pi(0-) = 0$ that models the aggregate dividend until t for the continuous strategy. On the other hand, $L_p^\pi(t)$ is a non-decreasing and $\mathbb{F}$-adapted process of the form

$$L_p^\pi(t) = \int_{[0,t]} \nu^\pi(s) \mathrm{d}N^r(s), \qquad t \geq 0, \tag{2.4}$$

where, for each $s \geq 0$, $\nu^\pi(s)$ represents the periodic dividend payment at time s associated with the strategy π. In particular, the periodic dividend payment at time $T(i)$ is given by $\nu^\pi(T(i))$ for each $i \geq 1$.

The surplus process U^π after dividends are deducted is such that

$$U^\pi(t) := X(t) - L^\pi(t) = X(t) - L_c^\pi(t) - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \nu^\pi(T(i)) 1_{\{T(i) \leq t\}}, \qquad 0 \leq t \leq \eta_0^\pi,$$

where

$$\eta_0^\pi := \inf\{t > 0 : U^\pi(t) < 0\}$$

is the corresponding ruin time. Here and throughout, let $\inf \varnothing = \infty$. While the payment of dividends is allowed to cause immediate ruin, it cannot exceed the amount of surplus currently available. In other words, we assume that

$$0 \leq \Delta L^\pi(t) \leq U^\pi(t-) + \Delta X(t), \qquad \text{for } t \geq 0. \tag{2.5}$$

We let $\mathcal{A}$ be the set of all admissible strategies that satisfy all the constraints described above.

The problem is to maximize, for $q > 0$, the expected NPV of dividends associated with the strategy $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$, defined as

$$\begin{aligned} v_\pi(x) &:= \mathbb{E}_x\Big(\int_{[0,\eta_0^\pi]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt} \big(\beta \mathrm{d}L_c^\pi(t) + \mathrm{d}L_p^\pi(t)\big)\Big) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_x\Big(\int_{[0,\eta_0^\pi]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt} \beta \mathrm{d}L_c^\pi(t) + \int_{[0,\eta_0^\pi]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt} \nu^\pi(t) \mathrm{d}N^r(t)\Big), \quad x \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Hence the problem is to compute the value function

$$v(x) := \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{A}} v_\pi(x), \quad x \geq 0,$$

and obtain the optimal strategy π^* that attains it, if such a strategy exists.

Remark 2.1. *In Avanzi et al.* [5]*, the objective is to maximize, for $\beta_c, \beta_p > 0$,*

$$V_\pi(x) := \mathbb{E}_x\Big(\int_{[0,\eta_0^\pi]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt} \big(\beta_c \mathrm{d}L_c^\pi(t) + \beta_p \mathrm{d}L_p^\pi(t)\big)\Big), \quad x \geq 0.$$

Solving this is equivalent to maximizing (2.6) *by setting* $\beta := \beta_c/\beta_p$. *See Remark 2.1 of* [6] *for a similar reduction.*

3. Hybrid barrier strategies

In this section, we define *the hybrid barrier strategy* $\pi_{a,b} = (L_p^{(a,b)}, L_c^{(a,b)})$ for $b \geq a \geq 0$. At each periodic dividend decision times $\mathcal{T}_r$ at which the surplus is above a, the excess is paid (Parisian reflection). On the other hand, as in the classical barrier strategy, dividends are also paid so that the surplus does not exceed b at any time (classical reflection). The resulting controlled surplus process becomes a *Lévy process with Parisian and classical reflection above*:

$$U_r^{(a,b)}(t) = X(t) - L_p^{(a,b)}(t) - L_c^{(a,b)}(t), \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3.1}$$

where $L_p^{(a,b)}(t)$ and $L_c^{(a,b)}(t)$ are, respectively, the amounts of Parisian and classical reflection (dividends under periodic and continuous barrier strategies) accumulated until time t. The formal construction of $(U_r^{(a,b)}, L_p^{(a,b)}, L_c^{(a,b)})$ is given in Section 3.2.

3.1. Lévy processes with Parisian reflection above.

Before constructing the process $U_r^{(a,b)}$ as in (3.1), we shall first review the *spectrally positive Lévy process with Parisian reflection above* (without classical reflection above), which we denote $X_r^a = (X_r^a(t); t \geq 0)$ for a fixed (Parisian) barrier a. Its dual is precisely the one studied in Avram et al. [8].

The process is only observed at times $\mathcal{T}_r$ and is pushed down to a if only if it is above a. More specifically, we have

$$X_r^a(t) = X(t), \quad 0 \leq t < T_a^+(1) \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$T_a^+(1) := \inf\{T(i) : \ X(T(i)) > a\}. \tag{3.3}$$

The process then jumps downwards by $X(T_a^+(1)) - a$ so that $X_r^a(T_a^+(1)) = a$. For $T_a^+(1) \leq t < T_a^+(2) := \inf\{T(i) > T_a^+(1) : \ X_r^a(T(i)-) > a\}$, we have $X_r^a(t) = X(t) - (X(T_a^+(1)) - a)$. The process can be constructed by repeating this procedure.

Suppose $L_p^a(t)$ is the cumulative amount of (Parisian) reflection until time $t \geq 0$. Then we have

$$X_r^a(t) = X(t) - L_p^a(t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

with

$$L_p^a(t) := \sum_{T_a^+(i) \leq t} (X_r^a(T_a^+(i)-) - a), \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3.4}$$

where $(T_a^+(n); n \geq 1)$ can be constructed inductively by (3.3) and

$$T_a^+(n+1) := \inf\{T(i) > T_a^+(n) : \ X_r^a(T(i)-) > a\}, \quad n \geq 1.$$

3.2. **Lévy processes with Parisian and classical reflection above.** We now construct the process $U_r^{(a,b)}$ by adding classical reflection in X_r^a. For $b \geq a \geq 0$, let

$$U^b(t) := X(t) - L_c^b(t) \quad \text{where } L_c^b(t) := \sup_{0\leq s\leq t} (X(s) - b) \vee 0, \quad t \geq 0, \tag{3.5}$$

be the process classically reflected from above at b (see Bayraktar et al. [9]).

We have

$$U_r^{(a,b)}(t) = U^b(t), \quad 0 \leq t < \widehat{T}_a^+(1) \tag{3.6}$$

where $\widehat{T}_a^+(1) := \inf\{T(i) : \ U^b(T(i)) > a\}$. The process then jumps downward by $U^b(\widehat{T}_0^+(1)) - a$ so that $U_r^{(a,b)}(\widehat{T}_a^+(1)) = a$. For $\widehat{T}_a^+(1) \leq t < \widehat{T}_a^+(2) := \inf\{T(i) > \widehat{T}_a^+(1) : \ U_r^{(a,b)}(T(i)-) > a\}$, the process $U_r^{(a,b)}(t)$ is the classical reflected process (in the form (3.5)) of the shifted process $X(t) - X(\widehat{T}_a^+(1)) + a$. The process can be constructed by repeating this procedure. It is clear that it admits a decomposition (3.1).

3.3. **Hybrid barrier strategies and their special cases.** For $0 \leq a \leq b$, the hybrid barrier strategy $\pi_{a,b} = (L_p^{(a,b)}, L_c^{(a,b)})$ is an admissible strategy, with $L_p^{(a,b)}$ admitting the form (2.4).

A *pure periodic barrier strategy* $\pi_{a,\infty}$ corresponds to the case $b = \infty$. It is clearly admissible and the resulting aggregate periodic dividend process and controlled surplus processes become L_p^a and X_r^a, respectively, as described in Section 3.1. The continuous part of dividends is uniformly zero.

A *pure continuous barrier strategy* $\pi_{b,b}$ corresponds to the case $a = b$. It is an admissible strategy with the resulting aggregate continuous dividend process and controlled surplus process L_c^b and U^b, as in (3.5). The periodic part of dividends is uniformly zero.

Finally, for the case $0 = a < b$, it is liquidated at the first periodic dividend payment opportunity.

4. Sufficient conditions for optimality

In this paper, we aim to show the optimality of a hybrid barrier strategy as defined in Section 3. Toward this end, we first derive the *verification lemma* and obtain sufficient conditions for optimality. This is a generalization of Lemma 4.1 of [5]. For verification of related stochastic control problems driven by spectrally one-sided Lévy processes, see Section 5.4 of [7], Lemma 4.1 of [14], and the proof of Lemma 6.1 in [30].

We call a measurable function g *sufficiently smooth* if g is $C^1(0,\infty)$ (resp. $C^2(0,\infty)$) when X has paths of bounded (resp. unbounded) variation. We let $\mathcal{L}$ be the operator for X acting on a sufficiently smooth function g, defined by

$$\mathcal{L}g(x) := -\gamma g'(x) + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} g''(x) + \int_{(0,\infty)} [g(x+z) - g(x) - g'(x) z \mathbf{1}_{\{0<z<1\}}] \Pi(\mathrm{d}z). \tag{4.1}$$

Lemma 4.1 (Verification lemma). *Suppose $\hat{\pi} \in \mathcal{A}$ is such that $v_{\hat{\pi}}$ is sufficiently smooth on $(0,\infty)$, and satisfies*

$$(\mathcal{L}-q)v_{\hat{\pi}}(x) + r\max_{0\le l\le x}\{l + v_{\hat{\pi}}(x-l) - v_{\hat{\pi}}(x)\} \le 0, \quad x>0, \tag{4.2}$$

$$v'_{\hat{\pi}}(x) \ge \beta, \quad x>0. \tag{4.3}$$

Then $v_{\hat{\pi}}(x) = v(x)$ for all $x \ge 0$ and hence $\hat{\pi}$ is an optimal strategy.

Proof. By the definition of v as a supremum, it follows that $v_{\hat{\pi}}(x) \le v(x)$ for all $x \ge 0$. We write $w := v_{\hat{\pi}}$ and show that $w(x) \ge v_{\pi}(x)$ for all $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \ge 0$.

Fix $x \ge 0$, $\pi \in \mathcal{A}$, and the corresponding surplus process U^{π}. Let $(T_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be the sequence of stopping times defined by $T_n := \inf\{t>0 : U^{\pi}(t) > n \text{ or } U^{\pi}(t) < 1/n\}$. Since U^{π} is a semi-martingale and w is sufficiently smooth on $(0,\infty)$ by assumption, we can use the change of variables/Itô's formula (cf. Theorems II.31 and II.32 of [29]) to the stopped process $(\mathrm{e}^{-q(t\wedge T_n)}w(U^{\pi}(t\wedge T_n)); t\ge 0)$ to deduce under $\mathbb{P}_x$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{e}^{-q(t\wedge T_n)}w(U^{\pi}(t\wedge T_n)) - w(x) = &-\int_0^{t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}qw(U^{\pi}(s-))\mathrm{d}s + \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}w'(U^{\pi}(s-))\mathrm{d}X(s)\\
&+\sum_{0\le s\le t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}\Big[\Delta w\Big(U^{\pi}(s-)+\Delta X(s)\Big) - w'(U^{\pi}(s-))\Delta X(s)\Big]\\
&-\int_0^{t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}w'(U^{\pi}(s-))\mathrm{d}L_c^{\pi,c}(s) + \sum_{0\le s\le t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}\Delta w\Big(U^{\pi}(s-)-\Delta L_c^{\pi}(s)\Big)\\
&+\frac{\sigma^2}{2}\int_0^{t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}w''(U^{\pi}(s-))\mathrm{d}s + \sum_{0\le s\le t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}\Delta w\Big(U^{\pi}(s-)-\nu^{\pi}(s)\Big)\Delta N^r(s),
\end{aligned}$$

where $L_c^{\pi,c}$ is the continuous part of L_c^{π}. Rewriting the above equation leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{e}^{-q(t\wedge T_n)}w(U^{\pi}(t\wedge T_n)) - w(x)\\
&\quad= \int_0^{t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}(\mathcal{L}-q)w(U^{\pi}(s-))\mathrm{d}s - \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}\nu^{\pi}(s)\mathrm{d}N^r(s)\\
&\qquad-\int_0^{t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}w'(U^{\pi}(s-))\mathrm{d}L_c^{\pi,c}(s) + \sum_{0\le s\le t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}\Delta w\Big(U^{\pi}(s-)-\Delta L_c^{\pi}(s)\Big)\\
&\qquad+\int_0^{t\wedge T_n}\mathrm{e}^{-qs}r\Big\{\nu^{\pi}(s) + w\Big(U^{\pi}(s-)-\nu^{\pi}(s)\Big) - w(U^{\pi}(s-))\Big\}\mathrm{d}s + M(t\wedge T_n).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the process M is the local martingale given by

(4.4)

$$\begin{aligned}M(t) :=& \int_0^t \sigma \mathrm{e}^{-qs} w'(U^\pi(s-))\mathrm{d}B(s) + \lim_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \int_{[0,t]} \int_{(\varepsilon,1)} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} w'(U^\pi(s-)) y (\mathcal{N}(\mathrm{d}s \times \mathrm{d}y) - \Pi(\mathrm{d}y)\mathrm{d}s) \\ &+ \int_{[0,t]} \int_{(0,\infty)} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \left[w(U^\pi(s-)+y) - w(U^\pi(s-)) - w'(U^\pi(s-)) y \mathbf{1}_{\{y \in (0,1)\}} \right] (\mathcal{N}(\mathrm{d}s \times \mathrm{d}y) - \Pi(\mathrm{d}y)\mathrm{d}s) \\ &+ \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \left[\nu^\pi(s) + w\Big(U^\pi(s-) - \nu^\pi(s)\Big) - w(U^\pi(s-)) \right] \mathrm{d}(N^r(s) - rs), \quad t \geq 0,\end{aligned}$$

where $(B(s); s \geq 0)$ is a standard Brownian motion and $\mathcal{N}$ is a Poisson random measure in the measure space $([0,\infty) \times (0,\infty), \mathcal{B}[0,\infty) \times \mathcal{B}(0,\infty), \mathrm{d}s \times \Pi(\mathrm{d}x))$.

On the other hand, using (4.3), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&- \int_0^{t\wedge T_n} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} w'(U^\pi(s-))\mathrm{d}L_c^{\pi,c}(s) + \sum_{0\leq s\leq t\wedge T_n} \mathrm{e}^{-qs}[\Delta w(U^\pi(s-) - \Delta L_c^\pi(s))] \\ &\qquad \leq -\beta \int_0^{t\wedge T_n} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \mathrm{d}L_c^{\pi,c}(s) - \beta \sum_{0\leq s\leq t\wedge T_n} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \Delta L_c^\pi(s) = -\beta \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \mathrm{d}L_c^\pi(s).\end{aligned}$$

By this and (2.5) and because w is nonnegative and X and N do not jump simultaneously a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}w(x) \geq& - \int_0^{t\wedge T_n} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \Big[(\mathcal{L} - q) w(U^\pi(s-)) + r \max_{0\leq l\leq U^\pi(s-)} \{ l + w(U^\pi(s-) - l) - w(U^\pi(s-)) \} \Big] \mathrm{d}s \\ &+ \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \nu^\pi(s) \mathrm{d}N^r(s) + \beta \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \mathrm{d}L^\pi(s) - M(t\wedge T_n).\end{aligned}$$

Using (4.2), we have

$$w(x) \geq - M(t\wedge T_n) + \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \nu^\pi(s) \mathrm{d}N^r(s) + \beta \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \mathrm{d}L^\pi(s). \tag{4.5}$$

Now taking expectations in (4.5) (recall that $M(\cdot \wedge T_n)$ is a zero-mean martingale) and letting t and n go to infinity ($T_n \nearrow \infty$ $\mathbb{P}_x$-a.s.), the monotone convergence theorem gives

$$w(x) \geq \lim_{t,n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}_x \left(\int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \nu^\pi(s) \mathrm{d}N^r(s) + \beta \int_{[0,t\wedge T_n]} \mathrm{e}^{-qs} \mathrm{d}L_c^\pi(s) \right) = v_\pi(x).$$

This completes the proof. □

5. Computation of the expected NPV of dividends under $\pi_{a,b}$

In this section, we compute the expected NPV of dividends under the hybrid barrier strategy $\pi_{a,b}$ as defined in Section 3:

$$v_{a,b}(x) := v_{\pi_{a,b}}(x) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\int_{[0,\eta_0^{(a,b)}]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt}[\beta \mathrm{d}L_c^{(a,b)}(t) + \mathrm{d}L_p^{(a,b)}(t)]\right), \quad x \geq 0, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$\eta_0^{(a,b)} := \inf\{t > 0 : U_r^{(a,b)}(t) < 0\}.$$

The pure periodic case ($b = \infty$) and the pure continuous case ($a = b$) are given in Pérez and Yamazaki [26] and Bayraktar et al. [9], respectively. Here, we focus on the case $0 \leq a < b$.

Toward this end, we first review the scale function.

5.1. Review on scale functions.

Fix $q > 0$. We use $W^{(q)}$ for the scale function of the spectrally negative Lévy process $-X$. This is the mapping from $\mathbb{R}$ to $[0, \infty)$ that takes value zero on the negative half-line, while on the positive half-line it is a strictly increasing function that is defined by its Laplace transforms:

$$\int_0^\infty \mathrm{e}^{-\theta x} W^{(q)}(x)\mathrm{d}x = \frac{1}{\psi(\theta) - q}, \quad \theta > \Phi(q), \tag{5.2}$$

where ψ is as defined in (2.1) and

$$\Phi(q) := \sup\{\lambda \geq 0 : \psi(\lambda) = q\}. \tag{5.3}$$

We also define, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{W}^{(q)}(x) &:= \int_0^x W^{(q)}(y)\mathrm{d}y, \\
Z^{(q)}(x) &:= 1 + q\overline{W}^{(q)}(x), \\
\overline{Z}^{(q)}(x) &:= \int_0^x Z^{(q)}(z)\mathrm{d}z.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $W^{(q)}(x) = 0$ for $-\infty < x < 0$, we have

$$\overline{W}^{(q)}(x) = 0, \quad Z^{(q)}(x) = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{Z}^{(q)}(x) = x, \quad x \leq 0. \tag{5.4}$$

Define also

$$Z^{(q)}(x, \theta) := \mathrm{e}^{\theta x}\left(1 + (q - \psi(\theta))\int_0^x \mathrm{e}^{-\theta z} W^{(q)}(z)\mathrm{d}z\right), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},\ \theta \geq 0.$$

In particular, $Z^{(q)}(x, 0) = Z^{(q)}(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and, for $r > 0$,

$$Z^{(q)}(x, \Phi(q + r)) := \mathrm{e}^{\Phi(q+r)x}\left(1 - r\int_0^x \mathrm{e}^{-\Phi(q+r)z} W^{(q)}(z)\mathrm{d}z\right).$$

If we define $\tau_a^- := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) < a\}$ and $\tau_b^+ := \inf\{t \geq 0 : X(t) > b\}$ for any $b > a$, then, for $x \geq a$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^-}1_{\{\tau_b^+ > \tau_a^-\}}\right) &= \frac{W^{(q)}(b-x)}{W^{(q)}(b-a)}, \\ \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_b^+ + \theta(b-X(\tau_b^+))}; \tau_b^+ < \tau_a^-\right) &= Z^{(q)}(b-x,\theta) - W^{(q)}(b-x)\frac{Z^{(q)}(b-a,\theta)}{W^{(q)}(b-a)}, \quad \theta \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Remark 5.1. (1) *If X is of unbounded variation or the Lévy measure is atomless, it is known that $W^{(q)}$ is $C^1(\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\})$; see, e.g.,* [11, Theorem 3].

(2) *Regarding the asymptotic behavior near zero, as in Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 of* [18],

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(q)}(0) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } X \text{ is of unbounded variation,} \\ \frac{1}{c} & \text{if } X \text{ is of bounded variation,} \end{cases} \\ W^{(q)\prime}(0+) &= \begin{cases} \frac{2}{\sigma^2} & \text{if } \sigma > 0, \\ \infty & \text{if } \sigma = 0 \text{ and } \Pi(0,\infty) = \infty, \\ \frac{q+\Pi(0,\infty)}{c^2} & \text{if } \sigma = 0 \text{ and } \Pi(0,\infty) < \infty. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

On the other hand, as in Lemma 3.3 of [18],

$$\mathrm{e}^{-\Phi(q)x}W^{(q)}(x) \nearrow \psi'(\Phi(q))^{-1}, \quad \text{as } x \uparrow \infty. \tag{5.7}$$

In this paper, we use the following versions of the scale function: for $a < b$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &:= W^{(q+r)}(b-x) - r\int_0^{a-x} W^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y, \\ \overline{W}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &:= \overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-x) - r\int_0^{a-x} W^{(q)}(a-x-y)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y, \\ Z_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x,\theta) &:= Z^{(q+r)}(b-x,\theta) - r\int_0^{a-x} W^{(q)}(a-x-y)Z^{(q+r)}(y-a+b,\theta)\mathrm{d}y, \quad \theta \geq 0, \\ \overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &:= \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-x) - r\int_0^{a-x} W^{(q)}(a-x-y)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y. \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

Remark 5.2. *For $a < b$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we can write*

$$\begin{aligned} W_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &= W^{(q)}(b-x) + r\int_0^{b-a} W^{(q)}(b-u-x)W^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u, \\ Z_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x,\theta) &= Z^{(q)}(b-x,\theta) + r\int_0^{b-a} W^{(q)}(b-u-x)Z^{(q+r)}(u,\theta)\mathrm{d}u, \quad \theta \geq 0, \\ \overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &= \overline{Z}^{(q)}(b-x) + r\int_0^{b-a} W^{(q)}(b-u-x)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u. \end{aligned}$$

These hold by (5) of [22] *and (3.4) of* [25].

5.2. **The expression for $v_{a,b}$ in terms of the scale function.** We will now present some preliminary results that will allow us to express the function $v_{a,b}$ given by (5.1) in terms of scale functions. The proofs of the following results are lengthy and hence are deferred to Appendix A.

Define

$$\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) := \frac{1}{r+q}\left(q\frac{Z_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + rZ^{(q)}(a-x)\right), \quad a<b, x\in\mathbb{R}. \tag{5.9}$$

Proposition 5.1. *For $q>0$, $0\le a<b$, and $x\ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_x\left(\int_{[0,\eta_0^{(a,b)}]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt}\mathrm{d}L_p^{(a,b)}(t)\right) = \frac{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}k_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) - k_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x), \tag{5.10}$$

where

$$k_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) := \frac{r}{q+r}\left(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a-x) - \frac{r}{q}\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)Z^{(q)}(a-x) - \overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)\right).$$

Proposition 5.2. *For $q>0$, $0\le a<b$, and $x\ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_x\left(\int_{[0,\eta_0^{(a,b)}]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt}\mathrm{d}L_c^{(a,b)}(t)\right) = \frac{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}i_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) - i_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x), \tag{5.11}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} i_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) := {}& \overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) \\ & + \frac{r}{q}Z^{(q)}(a-x)\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Let, for $0\le a<b$ and $x\ge 0$,

$$\Gamma(a,b;x) := \frac{r}{q+r}\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a-x) + \frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q} + \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\left[\overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) + \frac{r}{q}Z^{(q)}(a-x)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\right],$$

where, in particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(a,b) &:= \Gamma(a,b;0) \\ &= \frac{r}{q+r}\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a) + \frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q} + \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\left[\overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) + \frac{r}{q}Z^{(q)}(a)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Combining Propositions 5.1 and 5.2, we have the following.

Theorem 5.1. *For $0\le a<b$ and $x\ge 0$,*

$$v_{a,b}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\Gamma(a,b) - \Gamma(a,b;x), \tag{5.13}$$

where, in particular, for $x\ge b$, we have $v_{a,b}(x) = \beta(x-b) + v_{a,b}(b)$.

6. The selection of a^* and b^*

For the optimality of the hybrid barrier strategy $\pi_{a,b}$ constructed in Section 3, we shall assume the following relation on the parameters β, r, and q.

Assumption 6.1. *We assume that* $r/(q+r) < \beta < 1$.

This is assumed throughout this section and also in Section 7. The cases $\beta \geq 1$ and $\beta \leq r/(q+r)$, where the pure continuous and periodic barrier strategies are shown to be optimal, are deferred to Section 8.

6.1. Smoothness conditions.

In order to obtain the optimal thresholds, which we call a^* and b^*, we will ask that the value function v_{a^*,b^*} is smooth enough. For any choice of $0 \leq a < b$, it is clear that $v_{a,b}$ is continuous for $x \geq 0$. Its derivatives, whenever they exist, are given by

$$v_{a,b}^{(n)}(x) = \frac{\dfrac{\partial^n}{\partial x^n}\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\Gamma(a,b) - \frac{\partial^n}{\partial x^n}\Gamma(a,b;x), \quad n \geq 1.$$

Fix $0 \leq a < b$. We shall first compute, in the following lemma, the derivatives of $\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}$ and Γ. Its proof is given in Appendix B.

Lemma 6.1. *Fix* $0 \leq a < b$. *(i) For* $x \neq a$,

(6.1)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &= \frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\Big[-W^{(q+r)}(b-x) \\
&\quad + r\Big(W^{(q+r)}(b-a)\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x) + \int_0^{a-x}\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)\prime}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big)\Big], \\
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &= \frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\Big[W^{(q+r)\prime}(b-x) \\
&\quad - r\Big(W^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)}(a-x) + \int_0^{a-x}W^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)\prime}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big)\Big], \\
\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3}\mathcal{K}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) &= \frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\Big[-W^{(q+r)\prime\prime}(b-x) + r\Big(W^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)\prime}(a-x) \\
&\quad + W^{(q)}(0)W^{(q+r)\prime}(b-x) + \int_0^{a-x}W^{(q)\prime}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)\prime}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big)\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

where we assume that $W^{(q+r)\prime}(b-x)$ *and* $W^{(q+r)\prime\prime}(b-x)$ *exist for the second and third equalities, respectively.*

(ii) For $x \neq a$,

(6.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Gamma(a,b;x) &= -\frac{r}{q+r}Z^{(q)}(a-x) - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[Z^{(q+r)}(b-x) - r\Big(Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x) \\
&\quad + (q+r)\int_0^{a-x} \overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big)\Big], \\
\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\Gamma(a,b;x) &= \frac{qr}{q+r}W^{(q)}(a-x) - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[-(q+r)W^{(q+r)}(b-x) + r\Big(Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)}(a-x) \\
&\quad + (q+r)\int_0^{a-x} W^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big)\Big], \\
\frac{\partial^3}{\partial x^3}\Gamma(a,b;x) &= -\frac{qr}{q+r}W^{(q)\prime}(a-x) - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[(q+r)W^{(q+r)\prime}(b-x) - r\Big(Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)\prime}(a-x) \\
&\quad + (q+r)\Big[W^{(q)}(0)W^{(q+r)}(b-x) + \int_0^{a-x} W^{(q)\prime}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big]\Big)\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

where we assume in the third equality that $W^{(q)\prime}(a-x)$ and $W^{(q)\prime}(b-x)$ exist.

In view of the first and second equalities in (6.1) and (6.2) and Remark 5.1, $v_{a,b}$ is $C^1((0,b)\cup(b,\infty))$ (resp. $C^2((0,b)\cup(b,\infty))$) when X has paths of bounded (resp. unbounded) variation. We shall choose the values of a and b so that the degree of smoothness there increases.

6.1.1. *Smoothness at b.* By the first equalities in (6.1) and (6.2),

$$v'_{a,b}(b-) = -q\frac{\Gamma(a,b)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\frac{W^{(q+r)}(0)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + \beta = -q\frac{\Gamma(a,b)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\frac{W^{(q+r)}(0)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + v'_{a,b}(b+).$$

Hence, in view of Remark 5.1 (2), for the case of bounded variation, $v_{a,b}$ is continuously differentiable if

$$\mathbf{C_b}: \Gamma(a,b) = 0, \tag{6.3}$$

while it holds automatically for the case of unbounded variation.

For the case of unbounded variation, again by Remark 5.1 (2) and the second equalities in (6.1) and (6.2),

$$v''_{a,b}(b-) = q\frac{\Gamma(a,b)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\frac{W^{(q+r)\prime}(0+)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} = q\frac{\Gamma(a,b)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\frac{W^{(q+r)\prime}(0+)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + v''_{a,b}(b+).$$

Hence, $v_{a,b}$ is twice continuously differentiable at b if (6.3) holds.

6.1.2. *Smoothness at a.* For the case of bounded variation, suppose $W^{(q+r)\prime}(b-a)$ exists. By the second equalities in (6.1) and (6.2),

(6.4)
$$v''_{a,b}(a-) = v''_{a,b}(a+) - rW^{(q)}(0)\Big[q\frac{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\frac{\Gamma(a,b)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)} + \Big(\frac{q}{r+q} - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\Big)\Big].$$

On the other hand, by straightforward differentiation (using Remark 5.2),

$$\gamma(a,b) := \frac{\partial}{\partial a}\Gamma(a,b) = \frac{r}{q+r}Z^{(q)}(a)\kappa(b-a), \quad 0<a<b, \tag{6.5}$$

where

$$\kappa(y) := 1 - \frac{1}{q}\Big(\beta(q+r)-r\Big)Z^{(q+r)}(y), \quad y>0.$$

Hence $v_{a,b}$ is twice continuously differentiable at a if (6.3) holds and

$$\mathbf{C_a}: \gamma(a,b) = 0 \Longleftrightarrow \frac{q}{\beta(q+r)-r} = Z^{(q+r)}(b-a) \tag{6.6}$$

is satisfied.

For the case of unbounded variation, suppose $W^{(q+r)\prime\prime}(b-a)$ exists. By the third equalities in (6.1) and (6.2) and Remark 5.1 (2), we obtain

(6.7)
$$v'''_{a,b}(a-) = v'''_{a,b}(a+) + rW^{(q)\prime}(0+)\Big[q\frac{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\frac{\Gamma(a,b)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)} + \Big(\frac{q}{r+q} - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\Big)\Big].$$

Hence $v_{a,b}$ is third continuously differentiable at a if (6.3) and (6.6) hold simultaneously.

In summary, we have the following.

Lemma 6.2. *Suppose $0 \le a < b$ are chosen so that $\mathbf{C_b}$ is satisfied. Then, the following holds:*

1. *$v_{a,b}$ is C^1 (resp. C^2) on $(0,\infty)$ for the case of bounded (resp. unbounded) variation.*
2. *Suppose in addition that $\mathbf{C_a}$ is satisfied. Then,*
   - (a) *for the case of bounded variation and if $W^{(q+r)\prime}(b-a)$ exists, then $v_{a,b}$ is twice continuously differentiable at a;*
   - (b) *for the case of unbounded variation and if $W^{(q+r)\prime\prime}(b-a)$ exists, then $v_{a,b}$ is third continuously differentiable at a.*

6.2. **Existence of a^*, b^*.** In view of (6.5), by Assumption 6.1,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\kappa(b-a) = \frac{q+r}{q}\Big(\beta(q+r)-r\Big)W^{(q+r)}(b-a) > 0, \quad b>a>0,$$

and

$$\gamma(b-,b) = \frac{r}{q+r}Z^{(q)}(b)\Big(1 - \frac{1}{q}\Big(\beta(q+r)-r\Big)\Big) = \frac{r}{q}(1-\beta)Z^{(q)}(b) > 0, \quad b>0. \tag{6.8}$$

Hence, in view of (6.5), for $b > 0$, there exists a minimizer $a(b) \in [0, b)$ of the mapping $a \mapsto \Gamma(a, b)$ such that it is strictly decreasing on $[0, a(b))$ and strictly increasing on $(a(b), b)$. In particular,

$$a(b) = 0 \iff \gamma(0+, b) \geq 0 \iff \kappa(b) \geq 0 \iff b \leq \epsilon, \quad b > 0, \tag{6.9}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is such that

$$1 - \frac{1}{q}\Big(\beta(q+r) - r\Big) Z^{(q+r)}(\epsilon) = 0; \tag{6.10}$$

this exists and is unique because, by Assumption 6.1, the left hand side is strictly decreasing in ϵ to minus infinity and

$$1 - \frac{1}{q}\Big(\beta(q+r) - r\Big) Z^{(q+r)}(0) = \frac{q+r}{q}(1-\beta) > 0.$$

With this ϵ, we have $a(b) = (b - \epsilon) \vee 0$ and

$$\underline{\Gamma}(b) := \min_{0 \leq a \leq b} \Gamma(a, b) = \Gamma((b-\epsilon) \vee 0, b). \tag{6.11}$$

In summary, we have the following:

Lemma 6.3. *Fix $b > 0$.*

(1) *If $b \leq \epsilon$, the mapping $a \mapsto \Gamma(a, b)$ is monotonically (strictly) increasing and $\underline{\Gamma}(b) = \Gamma(0, b)$.*
(2) *Otherwise, $a \mapsto \Gamma(a, b)$ decreases (strictly) on $[0, b - \epsilon)$ and increases (strictly) on $(b - \epsilon, b)$. It attains a local minimum at $a(b) = b - \epsilon$ and hence $\gamma(b - \epsilon, b) = 0$.*

We now show the following monotonicity property.

Lemma 6.4. *The function $\underline{\Gamma}(b)$ is (strictly) increasing to ∞.*

Proof. By Remark 5.2, for $b > a \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\Gamma(a, b) &= \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[\frac{\partial}{\partial b}\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) + \frac{r}{q}Z^{(q)}(a)Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\Big] \\
&= \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[Z^{(q)}(b) + rW^{(q)}(a)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) \\
&\quad + r\int_0^{b-a} W^{(q)\prime}(b-u)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u + \frac{r}{q}Z^{(q)}(a)Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

By this and Assumption 6.1, we obtain a uniform lower bound

$$\inf_{0 \leq a < b} \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\Gamma(a, b) \geq \beta - \frac{r}{q+r} > 0. \tag{6.12}$$

Recall $\epsilon > 0$ such that (6.10) holds. Fix $b_1 < b_2$ such that $b_2 - b_1 < \epsilon$ (or $b_2 - \epsilon < b_1$).

(1) Suppose $b_2 \leq \epsilon$. Then, because $b_1 - \epsilon, b_2 - \epsilon \leq 0$ and by (6.11) and (6.12),

$$\underline{\Gamma}(b_2) = \Gamma(0, b_2) > \Gamma(0, b_1) = \underline{\Gamma}(b_1).$$

(2) Suppose $b_2 > \epsilon$. Then, because $b_2 - \epsilon \in (0, b_1)$ and by (6.11) and (6.12),

$$\underline{\Gamma}(b_2) = \min_{0\le y\le b_1} \Gamma(y, b_2) > \min_{0\le y\le b_1} \Gamma(y, b_1) = \underline{\Gamma}(b_1).$$

Finally, it is clear by (6.12) that $\underline{\Gamma}(b) \xrightarrow{b\uparrow\infty} \infty$. □

In view of Lemma 6.4, we first start at $b = 0$ and increase the value of b until we attain the desired pair (a^*, b^*) such that

$$\underline{\Gamma}(b^*) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad a^* = a(b^*).$$

For the case $b = 0$, by (2.3),

$$\underline{\Gamma}(0) = \Gamma(0, 0) = \beta\psi'(0+)/q < 0. \tag{6.13}$$

Hence we shall increase the value of b until we get b^* such that $\underline{\Gamma}(b^*) = 0$. Here, there are two scenarios:

(1) $\underline{\Gamma}(b^*) = \min_{0\le a\le b^*} \Gamma(a, b^*) = 0$ is attained at a local minimizer $a^* = b^* - \epsilon$;
(2) $\underline{\Gamma}(b^*) = \min_{0\le a\le b^*} \Gamma(a, b^*) = 0$ is attained at zero $a^* = 0$.

In both cases, we have $\Gamma(a^*, b^*) = 0$ (or $\mathbf{C_b}$). In addition, for (1), $\gamma(a^*, b^*) = 0$ holds as well, while for (2), we must have that $\Gamma(\cdot, b^*)$ is monotonically increasing (or $\partial\Gamma(\cdot, b^*)/\partial a \ge 0$) and hence (6.9) gives the inequality:

$$\gamma(0+, b^*) = \frac{r}{q+r}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{q}\Big(\beta(q+r) - r\Big)Z^{(q+r)}(b^*)\Big) \ge 0.$$

We summarize these in the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. *There exist a pair $0 \le a^* < b^*$ such that one of the following holds.*

(1) *$0 < a^* < b^*$ such that $\Gamma(a^*, b^*) = \gamma(a^*, b^*) = 0$.*
(2) *$a^* = 0 < b^*$ such that $\Gamma(a^*, b^*) = 0$ and $Z^{(q)}(b^* - a^*) = Z^{(q)}(b^*) \le q/(\beta(q+r) - r)$.*

6.3. **Convergence results.** We conclude this section with convergence results with respect to β and r. The following results indicate that the optimal hybrid barrier strategies approach the pure continuous/periodic barrier strategies, which are shown in the following section to be optimal when Assumption 6.1 does not hold.

Lemma 6.6. (1) *As $\beta \downarrow r/(q+r)$, we have $b^* \to \infty$.*
(2) *As $r \uparrow q\beta/(1-\beta)$ (and then $r/(q+r) \uparrow \beta$), we have $b^* \to \infty$.*
(3) *As $\beta \uparrow 1$, we have $b^* - a^* \to 0$.*

Proof. (1,2) For $b > 0$, we have

$$\Gamma(0, b) = \frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q} + \frac{q+r}{q}\Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b).$$

This together with Assumption 6.1 and (6.13) implies that $b \mapsto \Gamma(0,b)$ starts at a negative value $\Gamma(0,0)$ (see (6.13)) and strictly increases to infinity. Hence, we can define its unique root $b_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Gamma(0,b_0) = 0.$$

When $a(b_0) > 0$, it is clear that $b_0 < b^*$ because, by Lemma 6.3,

$$\underline{\Gamma}(b_0) = \Gamma(a(b_0), b_0) < \Gamma(0,b_0) = 0 = \underline{\Gamma}(b^*)$$

and $\underline{\Gamma}$ is a strictly increasing function by Lemma 6.4.

On the other hand, when $a(b_0) = 0$, then it is clear that $b_0 = b^*$ (and $a^* = 0$). In sum, we have

$$b_0 \le b^*. \tag{6.14}$$

Now, because

$$0 < -\frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q} = \frac{q+r}{q}\Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b_0).$$

we have $b_0 \to \infty$ as $\beta \downarrow r/(q+r)$ and $r \uparrow q\beta/(1-\beta)$. By (6.14), we have (1) and (2).

(3) From (6.10) and Lemma 6.5, it is clear that $b^* - a^* \le \epsilon$. Hence, as $\beta \uparrow 1$, it is clear from (6.10) that $\epsilon \to 0$ and hence $b^* - a^* \to 0$. □

7. Optimality of the hybrid barrier strategies

In this section, we show the optimality of π_{a^*,b^*} under Assumption 6.1. By Lemma 6.5, $\mathbf{C}_b$ is always satisfied and hence, by (5.13),

$$\begin{aligned} v_{a^*,b^*}(x) = -\Gamma(a^*,b^*;x) = &-\frac{r}{q+r}\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a^*-x) - \frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q} \\ &- \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}(a^*-x) + \frac{r}{q}Z^{(q)}(a^*-x)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.1}$$

We show that this solves the variational inequalities given in Lemma 4.1.

Recall the mapping $x \mapsto \mathcal{L}g(x)$ as in (4.1) for any sufficiently smooth function g of x.

Lemma 7.1. *We have*

$$(\mathcal{L}-q)v_{a^*,b^*}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{qr}{q+r}(a^*-x) - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[q(x-b^*) - r\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*)\Big] & x \ge b^*, \\ r\Big[\frac{q}{q+r}(a^*-x) - \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x) - \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*)\Big)\Big] & a^* < x < b^*, \\ 0 & 0 < x \le a^*. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $x > 0$, by (7.1),

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{L}-q)v_{a^*,b^*}(x) = &-\frac{r}{q+r}(\mathcal{L}-q)(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a^*-x)) + \beta\psi'(0+) \\ &- \Big(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\Big)\Big[(\mathcal{L}-q)(\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}(a^*-x)) + \frac{r}{q}\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*)(\mathcal{L}-q)(Z^{(q)}(a^*-x))\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{7.2}$$

Here, by e.g. the results in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in [9], for $x \neq a^*$,

$$(\mathcal{L}-q)(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a^*-x)) = \psi'(0+) + q(x-a^*)1_{\{x>a^*\}} \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{L}-q)(Z^{(q)}(a^*-x)) = -q1_{\{x>a^*\}}.$$

In addition, for $x > a^*$,

$$(\mathcal{L}-q)(\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}(a^*-x)) = (\mathcal{L}-q)(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x)) = \begin{cases} q(x-b^*)+\psi'(0+) & x \geq b^*, \\ r\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x)+\psi'(0+) & x < b^*, \end{cases}$$

and, for $x < a^*$, by using Lemma 4.5 of [12],

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{L}-q)(\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}(a^*-x)) &= (\mathcal{L}-q)\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x) - r\int_0^{a^*-x} W^{(q)}(a^*-x-y)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(y+b^*-a^*)\mathrm{d}y\right) \\ &= r\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x)+\psi'(0+) - r\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x) = \psi'(0+).\end{aligned}$$

Substituting these in (7.2), we have the claim. □

By how a^* and b^* are chosen as in Lemma 6.5, we have the following.

Lemma 7.2. (1) *We have* $v'_{a^*,b^*}(a^*) = 1$ *when* $a^* > 0$ *and* $v'_{a^*,b^*}(0+) \leq 1$ *when* $a^* = 0$.
(2) *We have* $v'_{a^*,b^*}(b^*) = \beta$.
(3) *The function* v_{a^*,b^*} *is concave on* $(0,\infty)$.

Proof. (1) By differentiating (7.1),

$$v'_{a^*,b^*}(x) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Gamma(a^*,b^*;x),$$

where, in particular, equation (6.2) gives

$$v'_{a^*,b^*}(a^*) = \frac{r}{q+r} + \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)Z^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*).$$

For the case $a^* > 0$, because $\mathbf{C}_a$ given by (6.6) is satisfied by Lemma 6.5 (1),

$$v'_{a^*,b^*}(a^*) = \frac{r}{q+r} + \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\frac{q}{\beta(q+r)-r} = 1.$$

For the case $a^* = 0$, by Lemma 6.5 (2),

$$v'_{a^*,b^*}(0+) \leq \frac{r}{q+r} + \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\frac{q}{\beta(q+r)-r} = 1.$$

(2) By (6.2), it is clear that $v'_{a^*,b^*}(x) = \beta$ for all $x \geq b^*$.
(3) (i) For $x < a^*$, integration by parts applied to the third equality of Remark 5.2 gives

$$\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}(a^*-x) = \overline{Z}^{(q)}(b^*-x) - r\overline{W}^{(q)}(a^*-x)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*) + r\int_0^{b^*-a^*} \overline{W}^{(q)}(b^*-x-u)Z^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u.$$

By differentiating this,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}(a-x) &= -Z^{(q)}(b^*-x) + rW^{(q)}(a^*-x)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*)\\ &\quad - r\int_0^{b^*-a^*} W^{(q)}(b^*-x-u)Z^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u,\\ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a^*-b^*}((a^*-x)+) &= qW^{(q)}(b^*-x) - rW^{(q)\prime}((a^*-x)+)\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*)\\ &\quad + r\int_0^{b^*-a^*} W^{(q)\prime}(b^*-x-u)Z^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (7.1) and Assumption 6.1,

$$\begin{aligned}v''_{a^*,b^*}(x) &= -\frac{rq}{r+q}W^{(q)}(a^*-x)\\ &\quad - \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\left(qW^{(q)}(b^*-x) + r\int_0^{b^*-a^*} W^{(q)\prime}(b^*-x-u)Z^{(q+r)}(u)\mathrm{d}u\right) \le 0.\end{aligned}$$

(ii) For $x > a^*$, by (6.2) and Assumption 6.1,

$$v''_{a^*,b^*}(x) = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2}\Gamma(a^*,b^*;x) = -\left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)(q+r)W^{(q+r)}(b^*-x) \le 0.$$

By (i) and (ii), together with the continuity of v'_{a^*,b^*} as in Lemma 6.2, v_{a^*,b^*} is concave. □

Lemma 7.3. *For $x \ge 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}M(x) &:= \max_{0\le l\le x}\{l + v_{a^*,b^*}(x-l) - v_{a^*,b^*}(x)\}\\ &= \left[\frac{q}{q+r}(x-a^*) - \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*) - \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x)\right)\right]1_{\{x>a^*\}}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the slope condition and the concavity of v_{a^*,b^*} as in Lemma 7.2 (see also Lemma 3.1 in [4]),

$$M(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } x \in [0,a^*],\\ x - a^* + v_{a,*b^*}(a^*) - v_{a^*,b^*}(x) & \text{if } x \in (a^*,\infty).\end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

Hence it is left to show for the case $x > a^*$. Indeed, by (7.1),

$$v_{a^*,b^*}(a^*) - v_{a^*,b^*}(x) = -\frac{r}{q+r}(x-a^*) - \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*) - \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x)\right),$$

and hence

$$M(x) = \frac{q}{q+r}(x-a^*) - \left(\beta - \frac{r}{q+r}\right)\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-a^*) - \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b^*-x)\right).$$

□

By Lemmas 7.1, 7.2, and 7.3, the main result is immediate.

Theorem 7.1. *The function v_{a^*,b^*} solves (4.2) and (4.3). Hence π_{a^*,b^*} is the optimal strategy.*

Proof. By Lemmas 7.1 and 7.3 and Assumption 6.1,

$$(\mathcal{L}-q)v_{a^*,b^*}(x)+rM(x)=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}(\beta-\frac{r}{q+r})(q+r)(b^*-x) & x\geq b^*\\ 0 & 0<x<b^*\end{array}\right\}\leq 0,$$

and hence v_{a^*,b^*} solves (4.2) . On the other hand, it solves (4.3) by Lemma 7.2. Hence, by Lemma 4.1, optimality holds.

□

8. Optimality of pure periodic and continuous strategies

In this section, we consider the case Assumption 6.1 does not hold. We shall show when $0\leq\beta\leq r/(r+q)$ that a pure periodic barrier strategy as defined in Section 3.3 is optimal; when $\beta\geq 1$, a pure continuous barrier strategy is optimal.

8.1. Optimality of the pure periodic barrier strategy.

Here we assume

$$0\leq\beta\leq\frac{r}{r+q}, \tag{8.1}$$

and show that it is optimal not to activate the continuous strategy ($b^*=\infty$).

Let $\mathcal{A}_p\subset\mathcal{A}$ be the set of strategies such that $L_c^\pi\equiv 0$ uniformly. Pérez and Yamazaki [26] studied the optimization problem over the restricted set $\mathcal{A}_p$. By Section 4.3 in [26], we have

$$\sup_{\pi\in\mathcal{A}_p}v_\pi(x)=v_{a_p^*,\infty}(x),\quad x>0,$$

where $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ is the value function under the periodic barrier strategy with the barrier $a_p^*\geq 0$, which is given as follows:

(1) For the case $\psi'(0+)<-q(r+q)/(r\Phi(q+r))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}v_{a_p^*,\infty}(x)=&-\frac{r}{r+q}\left(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a_p^*-x)+\frac{\psi'(0+)}{q}\right)\\&-\frac{1}{\Phi(q+r)}\left(\frac{r}{r+q}Z^{(q)}(a_p^*-x)+\frac{q}{r+q}Z^{(q)}(a_p^*-x,\Phi(q+r))\right),\quad x>0,\end{aligned} \tag{8.2}$$

where a_p^* is the unique root of

$$-\Phi(q+r)\frac{r}{r+q}\left(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a)+\frac{\psi'(0+)}{q}\right)=\frac{r}{r+q}Z^{(q)}(a)+\frac{q}{r+q}Z^{(q)}(a,\Phi(q+r)).$$

(2) If $\psi'(0+)\geq-q(r+q)/(r\Phi(q+r))$, then $a_p^*=0$ and

$$v_{0,\infty}(x)=\frac{r}{r+q}\left[x-\frac{\psi'(0+)}{r+q}\left(1-\mathrm{e}^{-\Phi(q+r)x}\right)\right],\quad x>0. \tag{8.3}$$

Now, in order to show that it is indeed optimal over the unrestricted set $\mathcal{A}$, it suffices to show that $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ solves the variational inequalities (4.2) and (4.3). By Theorem 4.1 and Lemma 4.3 in [26], the inequality (4.2) is already known to hold, and hence it remains to show (4.3).

By differentiating (8.2) and (8.3), we obtain, using (8.1) and taking limits,

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} v'_{a_p^*,\infty}(x) = \frac{r}{r+q} \geq \beta.$$

In addition, the concavity of $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ holds when $a_p^* > 0$ by Lemma 4.4 (1) of [26]; it also holds when $a_p^* = 0$, in view of the proof of Lemma 4.4 (2) of [26] and our assumption (2.3). Hence, for $x > 0$, we conclude that

$$v'_{a_p^*,\infty}(x) \geq \frac{r}{r+q} \geq \beta,$$

as desired.

8.2. **Optimality of the pure continuous barrier strategy.** We now assume that

$$\beta \geq 1,$$

and show that it is optimal not to active the periodic strategy (i.e. $a^* = b^*$).

Let $\mathcal{A}_c \subset \mathcal{A}$ be the set of strategies such that $L_p^\pi \equiv 0$ uniformly. Bayraktar et al. [9] studied the optimization problem over the restricted set $\mathcal{A}_c$. By equation (2.5) in [9] (with normalization), we have

$$\sup_{\pi\in\mathcal{A}_c} v_\pi(x) = v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}(x) = -\beta\left(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(b^*-x) + \frac{\psi'(0+)}{q}\right), \quad x > 0, \tag{8.4}$$

where

$$b_c^* := (\overline{Z}^{(q)})^{-1}(-\psi'(0+)/q). \tag{8.5}$$

Again, we shall show that $v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}$ solves the variational inequalities (4.2) and (4.3).

Because for $0 \leq l \leq x$,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial l}\left[l + v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}(x-l)\right] = \frac{\partial}{\partial l}\left[l - \beta\left(\overline{Z}^{(q)}(b_c^*-x+l) + \frac{\psi'(0+)}{q}\right)\right] = 1 - \beta Z^{(q)}(b_c^*-x+l) \leq 1-\beta \leq 0,$$

we have

$$\max_{0\leq l\leq x}\{l + v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}(x-l) - v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}(x)\} = 0, \quad x > 0.$$

This together with $(\mathcal{L}-q)v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}(x) \leq 0$ (by Theorem 2.1 in [9]) shows (4.2).

On the other hand, (4.3) holds because $v'_{b_c^*,b_c^*}(x) = \beta Z^{(q)}(b_c^*-x) \geq \beta$ for all $x > 0$.

9. Numerical Results

In this section, we confirm the analytical results obtained in the previous sections through a sequence of numerical experiments. Here, we assume that the underlying process X is the spectrally positive version of the *phase-type* Lévy process (with a Brownian motion) of [1]. This process admits an analytical form of the scale function as in [13], and is particularly important because it can approximate any spectrally positive Lévy process (see [1] and [13]).

We assume that

$$X(t) - X(0) = -ct + \sigma B(t) + \sum_{n=1}^{N(t)} Z_n, \quad 0 \le t < \infty, \tag{9.1}$$

where, $c \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma > 0$, $B = (B(t); t \ge 0)$ is a standard Brownian motion, $N = (N(t); t \ge 0)$ is a Poisson process with arrival rate κ, and $Z = (Z_n; n = 1, 2, \ldots)$ is an i.i.d. sequence of phase-type-distributed random variables with representation $(m, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{T})$, or equivalently the first absorption time in a continuous-time Markov chain consisting of a single absorbing state and m transient states with its initial distribution α and transition matrix $\boldsymbol{T}$ (see [1] for details). The processes B, N, and Z are assumed mutually independent. We refer the reader to [13, 18] for the forms of the corresponding scale functions.

9.1. **Computation of (a^*, b^*) and the value function v_{a^*,b^*}.** For the process X in (9.1), we set $\sigma = 0.2$ and $\kappa = 2$ and, for Z, we use the phase-type distribution with $m = 6$ that gives an approximation to the (folded) normal random variable with with mean 0 and variance 1 (see [19] for the values of α and $\boldsymbol{T}$). For the drift parameter c, we consider **Case 1** with $c = 1$ and **Case 2** with $c = 1.5$ to obtain the cases $a^* > 0$ and $a^* = 0$, respectively. For the other parameters, let $q = 0.05$, $r = 0.05$, and $\beta = 0.6$ so that Assumption 6.1 is satisfied.

The first step of implementation is the computation of the optimal barriers (a^*, b^*) as described in Lemma 6.5. As discussed in Section 6.2, we choose these such that $\underline{\Gamma}(b^*) = 0$ and $a^* = \arg\min_{a \ge 0} \Gamma(a, b^*)$. Thanks to Lemma 6.3 (that $a \mapsto \gamma(a, b) := \partial\Gamma(a, b)/\partial a$ is monotone), the minimizer $a(b)$ of $a \mapsto \Gamma(a, b)$ can be obtained by the bisection method. In addition, by Lemma 6.4, another bisection can be used to obtain b^* (and $a^* = a(b^*)$). With these a^* and b^*, the value function becomes v_{a^*,b^*} as in (7.1).

In the first two rows of Figure 1, we plot, for **Cases 1** and **2**, the mappings $a \mapsto \Gamma(a, b)$ and $a \mapsto \gamma(a, b)$ for various values of b. As in (6.12), $b \mapsto \Gamma(a, b)$ is uniformly increasing. The value $a(b)$ corresponds to the point (indicated by down-pointing triangles) at which $\Gamma(\cdot, b)$ attains a minimum and $\gamma(\cdot, b)$ vanishes (if $a(b) > 0$). The optimal pair is such that the minimum $\underline{\Gamma}$ is zero. In Figure 2, we plot the corresponding value functions v_{a^*,b^*} (solid) along with suboptimal NPVs $v_{a,b}$ (dotted) given in (5.13) with $(a, b) \ne (a^*, b^*)$. It can be confirmed in both cases that v_{a^*,b^*} dominates $v_{a,b}$, for $(a, b) \ne (a^*, b^*)$, uniformly in x.



Case 1 Case 2

FIGURE 1. Plots of $a \mapsto \Gamma(a,b)$ (top) and $a \mapsto \gamma(a,b)$ (bottom) for **Case 1** (left) and **Case 2** (right) for $b = b^*/5, 2b^*/5, \ldots, b^*, 6b^*/5$. The solid lines in red correspond to the cases for $b = b^*$. The down- and up-pointing triangles indicate the points at $a = a(b)$ and $a = b$, respectively.

9.2. **Sensitivity and convergence with respect to β and r.** We next study the behavior of the value function v_{a^*,b^*} with respect to β and r, and confirm the results we discussed in Sections 6.3 and 8. Here we use the same parameters as **Case 1** unless stated otherwise.

On the left of Figure 3, we plot the value function $v = v_{a^*,b^*}$ for $\beta \in (r/(q+r), 1)$ along with $v = v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ and $v = v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}$ as in (8.2) and (8.4), respectively, for the cases $\beta \le r/(q+r)$ and $\beta = 1$. It is confirmed that $v(x)$ for each $x > 0$ is increasing in β. As in Lemma 6.6 (1), as $\beta \downarrow r/(q+r)$, the value of b^* goes to infinity and consequently v_{a^*,b^*} converges decreasingly to $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ (which is independent of the value of β). On the other hand, as in Lemma 6.6 (3), as $\beta \uparrow 1$, the distance between a^* and b^* shrinks to zero and consequently the value function v_{a^*,b^*} converges increasingly to $v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}$ (under $\beta = 1$).



Case 1 Case 2

FIGURE 2. Plots of v_{a^*,b^*} (solid) along with suboptimal expected NPVs $v_{a,b}$ (dotted) for $a = 0, a^*/2, (a^*+b^*)/2$ and $b = (a^*+b^*)/2, b^*+0.5$. The values at a and b are indicated by up- and down-pointing triangles, respectively.

On the right of Figure 3, we plot the value function v for $r \in (0, q\beta/(1-\beta))$ along with the value functions $v = v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ and $v = v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}$ as in (8.2) and (8.4), respectively, for the cases $r = q\beta/(1-\beta)$ (equivalently $\beta = r/(q+r)$) and $r = 0$. It is confirmed that $v(x)$ for each $x > 0$ is increasing in r. As in Lemma 6.6 (2), as $r \uparrow q\beta/(1-\beta)$, the value of b^* increases to infinity and consequently the value function v_{a^*,b^*} converges increasingly to $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$ (which is independent of the value of β). On the other hand, as $r \downarrow 0$, periodic dividend opportunities vanish and hence the problem gets closer to the one defined in (8.4). Consequently b^* and v_{a^*,b^*} converge to those defined in (8.5) and (8.4), respectively.

APPENDIX A. PROOFS OF PROPOSITIONS 5.1 AND 5.2 AND THEOREM 5.1

In this appendix, we prove Propositions 5.1 and 5.2 and Theorem 5.1. Define, for $a < b$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x,\theta) := Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x,\theta) - W^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\frac{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a,\theta)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}, \quad \theta \geq 0,$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) &:= (q+r)^{-1}\Big(\frac{W^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\big[rZ^{(q+r)}(b-a)+q\big] + r\big[Z^{(q)}(a-x) - Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\big]\Big)\\ &= (q+r)^{-1}\Big(-r\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + q\frac{W^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + rZ^{(q)}(a-x)\Big),\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(\cdot) = \mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(\cdot,0)$ for short. Note that we have the relation with $\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}$ as in (5.9) as follows:

$$\Big(r + \frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\Big)\frac{\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{r+q} = \mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x), \quad a < b, x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{A.1}$$



convergence in β



convergence in r

FIGURE 3. (Left) The value functions v_{a^*,b^*} (dotted) for $\beta = 0.51, 0.53, ..., 0.97, 0.99, 0.995$ along with the cases $\beta \leq r/(q+r) = 0.5$ and $\beta = 1$ (solid). The down- and up-pointing triangles show the points at a^* and b^*, respectively; the circle on the upper solid line shows the point at b_c^* of $v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}$ and that on the lower solid line is for the point at a_p^* of $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$. (Right) The value functions v_{a^*,b^*} (dotted) for $r = 0.001, 0.01, 0.02, ..., 0.07, 0.071, 0.072, 0.073, 0.074$ along with the cases $r \geq q\beta/(1-\beta) = 0.075$ and $r = 0$ (solid). The down- and up-pointing triangles show the points at a^* and b^*, respectively; the circle on the lower solid line shows the point at b_c^* of $v_{b_c^*,b_c^*}$ and that on the upper solid line is for the point at a_p^* of $v_{a_p^*,\infty}$.

For $0 \leq a < b$, define the hitting times of the processes X_r^a and U^b as defined in Section 3 by

$$\tau_b^+(r) := \inf\{t > 0 : X_r^a(t) > b\}, \quad \tau_0^-(r) := \inf\{t > 0 : X_r^a(t) < 0\},$$
$$\eta_a^- := \inf\{t > 0 : U^b(t) < a\}.$$

Throughout this appendix, let $\mathrm{e}_r = T(1)$ be the first periodic dividend decision time, which is an independent exponential random variable with parameter r.

A.1. **Proof of Proposition 5.1.** Let us denote the left hand side of (5.10) by $f_p(x,a,b)$. By an application of the strong Markov property at $\tau_b^+(r)$, noticing that

$$U_r^{(a,b)}(t) = X_r^a(t), \quad L_p^{(a,b)}(t) = L_p^a(t) \quad \text{for } t \in [0, \tau_b^+(r)) \quad \text{and} \quad U_r^{(a,b)}(\tau_b^+(r)) = b, \tag{A.2}$$

and using Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in [8], we obtain, for $x \geq 0$,

(A.3)
$$\begin{aligned} f_p(x,a,b) &= \mathbb{E}_x\Big(\int_{[0,\tau_b^+(r)\wedge\tau_0^-(r)]} \mathrm{e}^{-qt}\mathrm{d}L_p^a(t)\Big) + \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_b^+(r)};\tau_b^+(r)<\tau_0^-(r)\right) f_p(b,a,b) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)} h_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) - h_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) + \Big(\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)\Big) f_p(b,a,b), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$h_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) := \frac{r}{q+r}\Big[\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a-x) + \frac{\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)} W_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - (a-b)\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)\Big].$$

On the other hand, by the strong Markov property, (3.6), and that X does not have negative jumps,

$$f_p(b,a,b) = \mathbb{E}_b\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q(\eta_a^-\wedge \mathbf{e}_r)}\right) f_p(a,a,b) + \mathbb{E}_b\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\mathbf{e}_r}(U^b(\mathbf{e}_r)-a);\mathbf{e}_r<\eta_a^-\right). \tag{A.4}$$

Here, by the Laplace transform of η_a^- as in page 228 of [15],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_b\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q(\eta_a^-\wedge\mathbf{e}_r)}\right) &= \mathbb{E}_b\left(\mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)\eta_a^-}\right) + r\mathbb{E}_b\Big(\int_0^{\eta_a^-}\mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)s}\mathrm{d}s\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{r+q}\Big(r+q\mathbb{E}_b[\mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)\eta_a^-}]\Big) = \frac{1}{r+q}\left(r+\frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

and, using the resolvent for U^b given in Theorem 8.11 of [15] and integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_b\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\mathbf{e}_r}(U^b(\mathbf{e}_r)-a);\mathbf{e}_r<\eta_a^-\right) = r\mathbb{E}_b\left(\int_0^{\eta_a^-}\mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)s}(U^b(s)-a)\mathrm{d}s\right) \\ &= -r\int_{a-b}^0 u\frac{W^{(q+r)}(-u)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\mathrm{d}u = -\frac{r}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\left((a-b)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a) + \int_0^{b-a}\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(y)\mathrm{d}y\right). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting these in (A.4), we have

$$f_p(b,a,b) = -\frac{r\big((a-b)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a) + \int_0^{b-a}\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(y)\mathrm{d}y\big)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + \frac{1}{r+q}\left(r+\frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\right) f_p(a,a,b).$$

Hence, by (A.3), for all $x \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} f_p(x,a,b) &= \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_a^{(q,r)}(a)}\tilde{h}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) - \tilde{h}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{r+q}\Big(\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)\Big)\left(r+\frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\right) f_p(a,a,b), \end{aligned} \tag{A.6}$$

where

$$\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) := h^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\frac{r}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\left((a-b)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a) + \int_0^{b-a}\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(y)\mathrm{d}y\right)$$
$$= \frac{r}{q+r}\left[\overline{Z}^{(q)}(a-x) - \overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\frac{\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\right].$$

Now, setting $x=a$ and solving for $f_p(a,a,b)$ (using that $\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0)=1$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0)=\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0)=0$), we obtain that, by (A.1),

$$f_p(a,a,b) = \frac{\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}. \tag{A.7}$$

Hence, substituting (A.7) in (A.6) and using (A.1) (which holds for $x\in\mathbb{R}$), we obtain that

$$f_p(x,a,b) = \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) - \tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \left(\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)\right)\frac{\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}$$
$$= \frac{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) - \tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x).$$

This equals the right hand side of (5.10) because

$$\tilde{h}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) = k^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \frac{r}{q}\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x).$$

A.2. **Proof of Proposition 5.2.** In order to show Proposition 5.2, we first compute the following identity:

$$g(x,a,b,\theta) := \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_b^+(r)+\theta[b-X^a_r(\tau_b^+(r))]};\tau_b^+(r)<\tau_0^-(r)\right), \quad q>0, a<b, \theta\geq 0, x\geq 0.$$

The case $\theta=0$ has been computed by Theorem 3.1 of [8]. Here, we generalize it by using Lemma 2.1 of [22] and Corollary 4.1 in [8].

Proposition A.1. *For any $q>0$, $0\leq a<b$, $\theta\geq 0$, and $x\geq 0$,*

$$g(x,a,b,\theta) = \mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x,\theta) - \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a,\theta). \tag{A.8}$$

Proof. We prove this proposition in three steps.

(1) For $x\geq a$, by the strong Markov property and that X has no negative jumps, we obtain

$$g(x,a,b,\theta) = \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_b^+ + \theta[b-X(\tau_b^+)]};\tau_b^+<\tau_a^-\wedge\mathbf{e}_r\right) + \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q(\tau_a^-\wedge\mathbf{e}_r)};\tau_a^-\wedge\mathbf{e}_r<\tau_b^+\right)g(a,a,b,\theta).$$

By (5.5) for $\theta = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q(\tau_a^-\wedge \mathbf{e}_r)};\tau_a^-\wedge\mathbf{e}_r<\tau_b^+\right)&=\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^-};\tau_a^-<\tau_b^+,\tau_a^-<\mathbf{e}_r\right)+\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\mathbf{e}_r};\tau_a^-\wedge\tau_b^+>\mathbf{e}_r\right)\\&=\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)\tau_a^-};\tau_a^-<\tau_b^+\right)+\frac{r}{q+r}-\frac{r}{q+r}\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)(\tau_a^-\wedge\tau_b^+)}\right)\\&=\frac{r}{r+q}(1-Z^{(q+r)}(b-x))+\frac{W^{(q+r)}(b-x)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}(1+r\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)).\end{aligned}$$

This and the second equality of (5.5) give

$$\begin{aligned}g(x,a,b,\theta)&=Z^{(q+r)}(b-x,\theta)-W^{(q+r)}(b-x)\frac{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a,\theta)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\\&\quad+\left(\frac{r}{r+q}(1-Z^{(q+r)}(b-x))+\frac{W^{(q+r)}(b-x)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}(1+r\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a))\right)g(a,a,b,\theta).\end{aligned}\tag{A.9}$$

Now, for $x\geq 0$, by the strong Markov property and (A.9) and because $X_r^a=X$ on $[0,\tau_a^+]$ and $Z^{(q)}(a-y)=1$ for $y\geq a$,

$$\begin{aligned}g(x,a,b,\theta)&=\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}g(X(\tau_a^+),a,b,\theta);\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)\\&=\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}Z^{(q+r)}(b-X(\tau_a^+),\theta);\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)\\&\quad-\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}W^{(q+r)}(b-X(\tau_a^+));\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)\frac{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a,\theta)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\\&\quad+\left(\frac{r}{r+q}\left[\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}Z^{(q)}(a-X(\tau_a^+));\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)-\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}Z^{(q+r)}(b-X(\tau_a^+));\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)\right]\right.\\&\quad\left.+\frac{\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}W^{(q+r)}(b-X(\tau_a^+));\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}(1+r\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a))\right)g(a,a,b,\theta).\end{aligned}$$

Here, using Corollary 4.1 in [8] and Lemma 2.1 of [22], we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}Z^{(q+r)}(b-X(\tau_a^+),\theta);\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)&=Z_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x,\theta)-\frac{W^{(q)}(a-x)}{W^{(q)}(a)}Z_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a,\theta),\quad\theta\geq 0,\\\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}W^{(q+r)}(b-X(\tau_a^+));\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)&=W_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)-\frac{W^{(q)}(a-x)}{W^{(q)}(a)}W_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a),\\\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_a^+}Z^{(q)}(a-X(\tau_a^+));\tau_a^+<\tau_0^-\right)&=Z^{(q)}(a-x)-\frac{W^{(q)}(a-x)}{W^{(q)}(a)}Z^{(q)}(a).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}g(x,a,b,\theta)&=\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x,\theta)+\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)g(a,a,b,\theta)\\&\quad-\frac{W^{(q)}(a-x)}{W^{(q)}(a)}\left[\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a,\theta)+\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)g(a,a,b,\theta)\right].\end{aligned}\tag{A.10}$$

(2) (i) For the case X is of bounded variation, setting $x = a$ in (A.10) and solving for $g(a,a,b,\theta)$ (using $\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0,\theta) = 0$ and $W^{(q)}(0) > 0$), we obtain

$$g(a,a,b,\theta) = -\frac{\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a,\theta)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}. \tag{A.11}$$

(ii) Suppose X is of unbounded variation. In order to show that we obtain the same identity (A.11), it suffices to modify the proof of (3.21) of [8] (which considers the case $\theta = 0$). Define the spectrally negative Lévy process $\tilde{X} := -X$, and construct the dual process $\tilde{X}^0_r$ with the lower Parisian reflection barrier at 0 as in [8] and its hitting times $\tilde{\tau}^-_c(r) := \inf\{t > 0 : \tilde{X}^0_r(t) < c\}$ and $\tilde{\tau}^+_c(r) := \inf\{t > 0 : \tilde{X}^0_r(t) > c\}$ for $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have

$$g(a,a,b,\theta) = \mathbb{E}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}(r)+\theta(\tilde{X}^0_r(\tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}(r))+b-a)}; \tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}(r) < \tilde{\tau}^+_a(r)\right).$$

Now following the proof of (3.21) of Section 5 in [8], we arrive at

$$g(a,a,b,\theta) = \frac{W^{(q)}(b)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\mathcal{N} \tag{A.12}$$

with

$$\mathcal{N} := \mathbf{n}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q(\tilde{\tau}^-_0+\tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}\circ\Theta_{\tilde{\tau}^-_0})+\theta(\tilde{X}(\tilde{\tau}^-_0+\tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}+\Theta_{\tilde{\tau}^-_0})+b-a)}; \tilde{\tau}^-_0 < \tilde{\tau}^+_a, \tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}\circ\Theta_{\tilde{\tau}^-_0} < \mathbf{e}_r \wedge (\tilde{\tau}^+_0\circ\Theta_{\tilde{\tau}^-_0})\right),$$

where $\tilde{\tau}^+$ and $\tilde{\tau}^-$ are defined analogously to τ^+ and τ^- for $\tilde{X}$ and Θ is the time-shift operator and $\mathbf{n}$ denotes the excursion measure of the spectrally negative Lévy process $\tilde{X}$ away from zero (see [24] for more details). Here,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N} &= \mathbf{n}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tilde{\tau}^-_0}\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{X}(\tilde{\tau}^-_0)}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b}+\theta(\tilde{X}(\tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b})+b-a)}; \tilde{\tau}^-_{a-b} < \mathbf{e}_r \wedge \tilde{\tau}^+_0\right); \tilde{\tau}^-_0 < \tilde{\tau}^+_a\right)\\
&= \mathbf{n}\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tilde{\tau}^-_0}\left(Z^{(q+r)}(\tilde{X}(\tilde{\tau}^-_0)+b-a,\theta) - \frac{W^{(q+r)}(\tilde{X}(\tilde{\tau}^-_0)+b-a)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}Z^{(q+r)}(b-a,\theta)\right); \tilde{\tau}^-_0 < \tilde{\tau}^+_a\right)\\
&= -\frac{1}{W^{(q)}(b)}\left(Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a,\theta) - \frac{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a,\theta)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}W^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)\right) = -\frac{\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a,\theta)}{W^{(q)}(b)},
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the strong Markov property for the first equality, (5.5) for the second equality and a slight modification of Lemma 6.3 in [28] for the last equality. By substituting this in (A.12), we obtain (A.11).

(3) Now, for both the bounded and unbounded variation cases, using (A.11) in (A.10), the proof is complete.

□

Using the proposition above, we have the following.

Corollary A.1. *For any $q > 0$, $0 \le a < b$, and $x \ge 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_b^+(r)}[X_r^a(\tau_b^+(r)) - b]; \tau_b^+(r) < \tau_0^-(r)\right) = \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\mathcal{J}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) - \mathcal{J}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x),$$

where

$$\mathcal{J}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) := \overline{Z}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \frac{W_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{W^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\right).$$

Proof. Because $\partial_\theta Z^{(q+r)}(y,\theta)\big|_{\theta=0+} = \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(y) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(y)$ for $y \in \mathbb{R}$ (see the proof of Corollary 3.5 of [28]), we have

$$\partial_\theta \mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x,\theta)\big|_{\theta=0+} = \mathcal{J}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x). \tag{A.13}$$

Now the result follows by differentiating (A.8), setting $\theta = 0+$, and using (A.13). □

A.2.1. *Proof of Proposition 5.2.* Let us denote the left hand side of (5.11) by $f_c(x,a,b)$. By an application of the strong Markov property at $\tau_b^+(r)$, Proposition A.1, Corollary A.1, and (A.2), we have, for $x \ge 0$,

(A.14)

$$\begin{aligned} f_c(x,a,b) &= \mathbb{E}_x\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q\tau_b^+(r)}[X_r^a(\tau_b^+(r)) - b + f_c(b,a,b)]; \tau_b^+(r) < \tau_0^-(r)\right) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\mathcal{J}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a) - \mathcal{J}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) + \left(\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x) - \frac{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)}\mathcal{I}_{a-b}^{(q,r)}(a)\right) f_c(b,a,b). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the strong Markov property at $\eta_a^- \wedge \mathbf{e}_r$ and because $L_c^{(a,b)} = L_c^b$ on $[0, \eta_a^- \wedge \mathbf{e}_r]$ and X does not have negative jumps,

$$f_c(b,a,b) = \mathbb{E}_b\left(\int_0^{\eta_a^- \wedge \mathbf{e}_r} \mathrm{e}^{-qt}\mathrm{d}L_c^b(t)\right) + \mathbb{E}_b\left(\mathrm{e}^{-q(\eta_a^- \wedge \mathbf{e}_r)}\right) f_c(a,a,b). \tag{A.15}$$

Here, as in the proof of Theorem 1 of [7], the first term on the right hand side is

(A.16)

$$\mathbb{E}_b\left(\int_0^{\eta_a^- \wedge \mathbf{e}_r} \mathrm{e}^{-qt}\mathrm{d}L_c^b(t)\right) = \mathbb{E}_b\left(\int_0^{\eta_a^-} \mathrm{e}^{-(q+r)t}\mathrm{d}L_c^b(t)\right) = \frac{\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}.$$

Hence, using (A.5) and (A.16) in (A.15),

$$f_c(b,a,b) = \frac{\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + \frac{1}{r+q}\left(r + \frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\right) f_c(a,a,b).$$

Substituting this in (A.14) and using (A.1) (which holds for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$),

(A.17)
$$\begin{aligned} f_c(x,a,b) &= \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) - \tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) \\ &\quad + \left(\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)\right)\frac{1}{r+q}\left(r + \frac{q}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\right) f_c(a,a,b) \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) - \tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \left(\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \frac{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)\right) f_c(a,a,b), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) &:= -\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\frac{\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)} + \mathcal{J}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) \\ &= \overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \frac{Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)}\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence setting $x = a$ and solving for $f_c(a,a,b)$ (using $\mathcal{H}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0) = \mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0) = 1$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0) = \tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(0) = 0$) gives that $f_c(a,a,b) = \tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)/\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)$. Substituting this in (A.17), we obtain

$$f_c(x,a,b) = \frac{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) - \tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x).$$

This equals the right hand side of (5.11) because

$$\tilde{i}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) = i^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \frac{(r+q)\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{q}\left(\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a) - \psi'(0+)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\right).$$

A.3. **Proof of Theorem 5.1.** Using Propositions 5.1 and 5.2,

$$v_{a,b}(x) = \frac{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)}{\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)}\left(k^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a) + \beta i^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a)\right) - \left(k^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \beta i^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\right). \tag{A.18}$$

In order to show that this reduces to (5.13), it is sufficient to show

$$k^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \beta i^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) = \Gamma(a,b;x) - \frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q}\mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)Z^{(q+r)}(b-a); \tag{A.19}$$

substituting this in (A.18) and after simplification, we get (5.13).

We have

$$\begin{aligned} &k^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + \beta i^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - \Gamma(a,b,x) \\ &\qquad = -\frac{\beta\psi'(0+)}{q}\left(q\overline{W}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + rZ^{(q)}(a-x)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a) + 1\right). \end{aligned} \tag{A.20}$$

By (5.8), $Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) = (q+r)\overline{W}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + 1 - r\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x)$ and hence

$$\frac{1}{q+r}\Big[Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - 1 + r\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x)\Big] = \overline{W}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x). \tag{A.21}$$

Now using (A.21) we obtain by straightforward computations

$$\begin{aligned}
&q\overline{W}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) + rZ^{(q)}(a-x)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\\
&\quad= \frac{q}{q+r}\Big[Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) - 1 + r\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x)\Big] + rZ^{(q)}(a-x)\overline{W}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\\
&\quad= \mathcal{K}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)Z^{(q+r)}(b-a) - 1.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting this in (A.20), we have (A.19), as desired.

Appendix B. Proof of Lemma 6.1

For $a < b$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$, integration by parts gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) &= \overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-x)\\
&\quad - r\Big[\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x) + \int_0^{a-x}\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x-y)Z^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big],\\
Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) &= Z^{(q+r)}(b-x)\\
&\quad - r\Big[Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x) + (q+r)\int_0^{a-x}\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $x \neq a$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\overline{Z}^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x)\\
&= -Z^{(q+r)}(b-x) + r\Big[\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)}(a-x) + \int_0^{a-x}W^{(q)}(a-x-y)Z^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big]\\
&= -Z^{(q+r)}(b-x) + r\Big[\overline{Z}^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)}(a-x) + Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x)\\
&\quad + (q+r)\int_0^{a-x}\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big],
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial x}Z^{(q,r)}_{a-b}(a-x) &= -(q+r)W^{(q+r)}(b-x) + r\Big[Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)}(a-x)\\
&\quad + (q+r)\int_0^{a-x}W^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big]\\
&= -(q+r)W^{(q+r)}(b-x) + r\Big[Z^{(q+r)}(b-a)W^{(q)}(a-x)\\
&\quad + (q+r)\Big(W^{(q+r)}(b-a)\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x) + \int_0^{a-x}\overline{W}^{(q)}(a-x-y)W^{(q+r)\prime}(y-a+b)\mathrm{d}y\Big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

By differentiating further, the results are immediate.

REFERENCES

[1] ASMUSSEN, S., AVRAM, F., AND PISTORIUS, M.R. Russian and American put options under exponential phase-type Lévy models. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **109(1)**, 79–111, (2004).

[2] AVANZI, B., GERBER, H.U., AND SHIU, E. Optimal dividends in the dual model. *Insur. Math. Econ.* **41(1)**, 111-123, (2007).

[3] AVANZI, B. AND GERBER, H.U. Optimal dividends in the dual model with diffusion. *Astin Bull.* **38(2)**, 653-667, (2008).

[4] AVANZI, B., TU, V., AND WONG, B. On optimal periodic dividend strategies in the dual model with diffusion. *Insur. Math. Econ.* **55**, 210-224, (2014).

[5] AVANZI, B., TU, V., AND WONG, B. On the interface between optimal periodic and continuous strategies in the presence of transaction costs. *Astin Bull.* **46(3)**, 709-746, (2016).

[6] AVANZI, B., PÉREZ, J. L., WONG, B., AND YAMAZAKI, K. On optimal joint reflective and refractive dividend strategies in spectrally positive Lévy models. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics.* available online, (2016).

[7] AVRAM, F., PALMOWSKI, Z., AND PISTORIUS, M.R. On the optimal dividend problem for a spectrally negative Lévy process. *Ann. Appl. Probab.* **17**, 156-180, (2007).

[8] AVRAM, F., PÉREZ, J.L., AND YAMAZAKI, K. Spectrally negative Lévy processes with Parisian reflection below and classical reflection above. *arXiv:*1604.01436, (2016).

[9] BAYRAKTAR, E., KYPRIANOU, A.E., AND YAMAZAKI, K. On optimal dividends in the dual model. *Astin Bull.* **43(3)**, 359-372, (2013).

[10] BERTOIN, J. *Lévy processes.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1996).

[11] CHAN, T., KYPRIANOU, A.E., AND SAVOV, M. Smoothness of scale functions for spectrally negative Lévy processes. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **150**, 691-708, (2011).

[12] EGAMI, M. AND YAMAZAKI, K. Precautionary measures for credit risk management in jump models. *Stochastics*, **85(1)**, 111–143, (2013).

[13] EGAMI, M. AND YAMAZAKI, K. Phase-type fitting of scale functions for spectrally negative Lévy processes. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **264**, 1–22, (2014).

[14] HERNÁNDEZ-HERNÁNDEZ, D., PÉREZ, J.L., AND YAMAZAKI, K. Optimality of Refraction Strategies for Spectrally Negative Lévy Processes. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **54(3)**, 1126-1156, (2016).

[15] KYPRIANOU, A.E. *Introductory lectures on fluctuations of Lévy processes with applications.* Springer, Berlin, (2006).

[16] KYPRIANOU, A.E., LOEFFEN, R. Refracted Lévy processes. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré,* 46 (1), 24–44, (2010).

[17] KYPRIANOU, A.E., LOEFFEN, R., AND PÉREZ, J.L. Optimal control with absolutely continuous strategies for spectrally negative Lévy processes. *J. Appl. Probab.* **49(1)**, 150-166, (2012).

[18] KUZNETSOV, A., KYPRIANOU, A.E., AND RIVERO, V. The theory of scale functions for spectrally negative Lévy processes. *Lévy Matters II, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, (2013).

[19] LEUNG, T., YAMAZAKI, K., AND ZHANG, H. An analytic recursive method for optimal multiple stopping: Canadization and phase-type fitting. *Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance* **18(5)**, 1550032, (2015).

[20] LI, Y., LI, Z., AND ZENG, Y. Equilibrium Dividend Strategy with Non-exponential Discounting in a Dual Model. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, **168(2)**, 699-722, (2016).

[21] LOEFFEN, R. On optimality of the barrier strategy in de Finetti's dividend problem for spectrally negative Lévy processes. *The Annals of Applied Probability* **18.5**, 1669-1680 (2008).

[22] LOEFFEN, R.L., RENAUD, J-F. AND ZHOU, X. OCCUPATION TIMES OF INTERVALS UNTIL FIRST PASSAGE TIMES FOR SPECTRALLY NEGATIVE LÉVY PROCESSES WITH APPLICATIONS. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, **124 (3)**, 1408–1435, (2014).

[23] MARCINIAK, E., AND PALMOWSKI, Z. On the Optimal Dividend Problem in the Dual Model with Surplus-Dependent Premiums. *arXiv* **1605.04584**, (2016).

[24] PARDO, J.C., PÉREZ, J.L. AND RIVERO, V. The excursion measure away from zero for spectrally negative Lévy processes. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré,* (forthcoming).

[25] PÉREZ, J.L. AND YAMAZAKI, K. On the refracted-reflected spectrally negative Lévy processes. *arXiv* **1511.06027**, (2016).

[26] PÉREZ, J.L. AND YAMAZAKI, K. On the optimality of periodic barrier strategies for a spectrally positive Lévy process. *arXiv* **1604.07718**, (2016).

[27] PÉREZ, J.L. AND YAMAZAKI, K. Refraction-Reflection Strategies in the Dual Model. *Astin Bulletin*, (forthcoming).

[28] PÉREZ, J.L. AND YAMAZAKI, K. Mixed periodic-classical barrier strategies for Lévy risk process. *arXiv* **1609.01671**, (2016).

[29] PROTTER, P. *Stochastic integration and differential equations. 2nd Edition*, SPRINGER, BERLIN, (2005).

[30] YAMAZAKI, K. Inventory Control for Spectrally Positive Levy Demand Processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, (forthcoming).

[31] YIN, C., WEN, Y., AND ZHAO, Y. On the optimal dividend problem for a spectrally positive Lévy process. *Astin Bulletin*, **44(3)**, 635–651, (2014).

[32] YIN, C. AND WEN, Y. Optimal dividend problem with a terminal value for spectrally positive Lévy processes. *Insur. Math. Econ.*, **53(3)**, 769–773, (2013).

[33] ZHAO, Y., WANG, R., YAO, D., AND CHEN, P. Optimal dividends and capital injections in the dual model with a random time horizon. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, **167(1)**, 272-295, (2015).